

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/076,540 | YEE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Srirama Channavajjala | 2166 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) Srirama Channavajjala.

(3) _____.

(2) Michael A. Schwartz, Registration No 40,161..

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 February 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-42

Prior art documents discussed:


See Continuation Sheet

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed:

A telephone was made to applicant's representative Attorney, Michael A. Schwartz, Registration No. 40,161 about the potential amendment to the claims, and specification page 23 in order to allow the case. The representative agreed with the Examiner's proposal and authorization has given for an Examiner's Amendment.